

FILED  
SCRANTON

Dexter Hull &lt;dexter2bros@gmail.com&gt;

affidavit

1 message

NOV 13 2024

PER

Amo  
DEPUTY CLERK

3:23CR27

Dexter Hull &lt;dexter2bros@gmail.com&gt;

Fri, Nov 8, 2024 at 5:05 PM

To: Dexter Hull &lt;dexter2bros@gmail.com&gt;, Darren Keys &lt;legalinfoallstars@gmail.com&gt;

## AFFIDAVIT NO. 5

Please record the updated Motion to  
Exclude the Cell Phone It is  
stapled so it can't be missed

Upon information and belief, I Dexter Hull being of sound mind and over the age of 18, do hereby declare under the Pain and Penalty of perjury pursuant to 18 USC 1746 that the foregoing is true, complete, and correct to the best of my knowledge:

1. I, Dexter Hull, have been appointed by Asiana Williams to be her Attorney in fact, Power of Attorney, and Next Friend to assist with her legal court proceedings which includes but is not limited to:
2. The filing of legal documents and motions due to her limited access to legal materials, the drafting of such legal documents, etc.
3. Asiana expressed to me and to the court, that she would like for me to be her Counsel of Choice and assist her with her defense which are afforded her by the United States Constitution's Sixth Amendment.
4. The Sixth Amendment promises Asiana assistance with her defence.

**COMES NOW, Your Attorney in fact, next friend and member of group, Legal Info All-Stars, whose goal is to achieve minority justice litigation in the courts by virtue of Supreme Court Simms versus Ahern, 270 1S W.720 1925 which holds that THE PRACTICE OF LAW IS AN OCCUPATION OF COMMON RIGHT. Defendant Asiana Williams, a member of LIA, LLC was unlawfully arrested, discriminatory and falsely charged with death by Delivery under 18 USC section 841B1 and based on INACCURATE EVIDENCE AND A LACK OF EVIDENCE THAT WAS WITHHELD BY THE PROSECUTION, was found guilty by a MISINFORMED JURY. Power of Attorney and request for assistance was given to Dexter Hull on MARCH 1ST 2024 (POA is included). The court erroneously entered an order denying the defendant Assistance by her group of competent legal assistance because Dexter Hull is not a licensed Lawyer. Dexter Hull is not a licensed Lawyer but Dexter is Asiana's Attorney in Fact and Power of**

E11801

**Attorney. A Bar Card is not a license, It's a union dues card. Bar is a professional club oration operating out of Britain.**

**This presents a unique exception to the rule that a defendant may only be represented by a licensed Attorney At Law. In fact, this case falls under the narrow provision that allows for unlicensed lehman person to represent LITIGANTS DURING JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS. See brotherhood of trained men versus Virgina X.Virginia State Bar 377US1, Gideon versus Wainwright 372US335, OUR Arsinger versus Hamlin, Sharif 407US425 Litigants may be assisted by unlicensed Legman during judicial proceedings. See also, NAACP versus button 371US415, United Mine Workers Of America versus Gibs 383715, and Johnson versus Gibs 383715 and Johnson versus Avery 89 Supreme Court 747 1969, Members of groups who are competent non lawyers can assist other members of the group achieve the goal of the group in court WITHOUT BEING CHARGED WITH UNAUTHORIZED PRACTICE OF LAW. Next friend Federal rules of Civil Procedure rule 17 20 8USCA "Next Friend" a person who represents someone who is unable to tend to his or her own interest.**

I have entered my Notice of Apperance to the court and I am writting this affidavit at the request of the judge. Included are the Powers of Attorney and Attorney in Fact that I have received from Asiana Williams starting at March 1st, 2024 up til today. This authority was given to me to submit motions on Asiana's behalf. Nothing was ever submitted without written authority from Asiana.

Respectfully submitted,



Curtis Dexter Hull

2 of 12

Members of groups who are competent non-lawyers can assist other members of the group achieve the goals of the group or individual in court without being charged with "unauthorized practice of law". Laymen cannot be expected to know how to protect their rights when dealing with practiced and careful adversaries. (See, Gideon v. Wainwright, 372 U.S. 335, 83 S.Ct. 792, 9 L.Ed.2d 799 (1963), and for them to associate together to help one another to preserve and enforce rights granted them under federal laws cannot be condemned as a threat to legal ethics. Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen v. Virginia ex rel. Virginia State Bar, 377 U.S. 1, 7, 84 S.Ct. 1113, 12 L.Ed.2d 89 (1964)(Laypersons can associate together under the First Amendment to help one another preserve and enforce rights granted them under federal laws and cannot be condemned as a threat to legal ethics or as unauthorized practice of law). See also, United Mine Workers v. Illinois Bar Association, 389 U.S. 217, 88 S.Ct. 353, 19 L.Ed.2d 426 (1967); NAACP v. Button, 371 U.S. 415, 83 S.Ct. 328, 9 L.Ed.2d 405 (1963)(line of cases where U.S. Supreme Court held that a State may not pass statutes prohibiting the unauthorized practice of law or to interfere with the Right to Freedom of Speech, Association or Right to Redress Government for Grievances as secured by the First Amendment). Counsel of choice is also protected by the Ninth and Tenth Amendments, secured in the penumbra of these Amendments, particularly the Ninth Amendment, which is protected in the states. Roe v. Wade, 410 U.S. 113, 93 S.Ct. 705, 35 L.Ed.2d 147 (1973)(this case also addressed the "capable of repetition, yet evades review" philosophy).

In the United States Supreme Court ruling in Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen v. Virginia ex rel. Virginia State Bar, 377 U.S. 1, 7 (1964):

"A State could not, by invoking the power to regulate the professional conduct of attorneys, infringe in any way the right of individuals and the public to be fairly represented in lawsuits authorized by Congress to effectuate a basic public interest. Laymen cannot be expected to know how to protect their rights when dealing with practiced and carefully counseled adversaries, cf. Gideon v. Wainwright, 372 U. S. 335, and for them to associate together to help one another to preserve and enforce rights granted them under federal laws cannot be condemned as a threat to legal ethics. The State can no more keep these workers from using their cooperative plan to advise one another than it could use more direct means to bar them from resorting to the courts to vindicate their legal rights. The right to petition the courts cannot be so handicapped."

See also, NAACP v. Button, 371 U.S. 415 (1963); Sperry v. Florida ex rel. Florida

Bar, 373 U.S. 379 (1963)(states may pass no laws on unauthorized practice of law).

The U.S. Department of Justice and Federal Trade Commission, which this letter will also be sent to, have addressed the use of non-lawyers to handle legal matters, and say that non-lawyers should be permitted to compete with attorneys. Competition will lead to lower prices, better products and services, and enhanced consumer choice. [http://www.ftc.gov/opp/advocacy\\_date.shtml](http://www.ftc.gov/opp/advocacy_date.shtml); [http://www.abanet.org/rppt/section\\_info/upl/FTCreProposedModelDefinition.pdf](http://www.abanet.org/rppt/section_info/upl/FTCreProposedModelDefinition.pdf); <http://www.ftc.gov/be/V070004.pdf>.

In its advocacy opinion letter to New York State Assemblywoman Helene E. Weinstein, dated April 27, 2007, the United States Justice Department/Federal Trade Commission stated the following with regard to New York Assembly Bill A01837 and A05596, <http://www.ftc.gov/be/V070004.pdf>:


"We are concerned that the proposed legislation, which would prevent non-attorneys from competing with attorneys in situations where there is no clear showing that non-attorney service providers have caused consumer harm, is not in the best interests of consumers."

The Justice Department and the FTC went on to say that they are entrusted with enforcing the federal antitrust laws:

"We work to promote free and unfettered competition in all sectors of the American economy. The United States Supreme Court has observed that "ultimately competition will produce not only lower prices, but also better goods and services." The heart of our

3 of 12





ASIANA

8:16

**On this 20th day of  
October, 2024  
I Asiana Williams, Hereby  
give Curtis Hull full  
and complete power of  
attorney over me.**

**Respectfully written,  
typed and e-signed by  
Asiana Williams**

Sent: 10/20/2024

ASIANA

8:35

**Dex can u please put \$100  
on my books its freezing  
I have no thermals and  
1 sweater. I also need  
hygiene and food. Please  
if u can, will u put it on as  
soon as possible i have**

*u of 12*

 **Write a reply**





**On February 25th 2024,  
I Asiana Williams gave  
Curtis Hull authorization  
to send my attorney  
Theron Solomon an  
Affidavit on my behalf.**

**Thankyou,**

**Asiana Williams**

**Sent: 2/25/2024**

**ASIANA**

**9:39**

**There I fixed the date  
because I messed it up  
sorry lol**

**Sent: 2/25/2024**

**You**

**10:54**

**GREAT**

**Sent: 2/25/2024**

**+ Write a reply**

5 of 12





ASIANA

12:55

On March 1st 2024, I  
Asiana Williams gave  
Curtis Hull authorization  
to file any motions on my  
behalf.

Thankyou,

Asiana Williams

Sent: 3/1/2024

Mar 02, 2024

You

2:16

Good morning, Tata salad,  
how you doing? you  
have a blessing on you!  
Keep confessing God's  
word and giving Jesus  
something to work with I

 Write a reply

6 of 12





ASIANA

5:42

**pending appeal 3143 - b  
trial transcript so you  
can capitalize off the  
prosecutors errors and  
any trial violations before  
u submit your post trial  
motions of acquittal and  
new trial.**

**OK I will do some**

Sent: 10/13/2024

Oct 14, 2024

ASIANA

3:53

**Good afternoon dex.. YOU  
HAVE THE BLESSING ON  
U  
I went over the affidavit  
of truth.. It was good it**




**Write a reply**

7 of 12







**text me another power  
of attorney letter and  
hand write and send it  
to ur moms house. Call  
me when u get this. YOU  
HAVE THE BLESSING ON  
YOU GOOD IS WITH YOU**

Sent: 10/20/2024

Approve

ASIANA

8:16

**On this 20th day of  
October, 2024  
I Asiana Williams, Hereby  
give Curtis Hull full  
and complete power of  
attorney over me.**

**Respectfully written,  
typed and e-signed by  
Asiana Williams**


Sent: 10/20/2024

 **Write a reply**

4 of 12







Oct 29, 2024

You

9:04

**Send me the attorney in  
fact for darren and me and  
research quo warrento**

Sent: 10/29/2024

Approve

ASIANA

9:37

**On this 29th day of  
October, 2024  
I Asiana Williams, Hereby  
give Curtis Dexter Hull  
and Darren Keyes full  
and complete power of  
attorney-in-fact over me.**


**Respectfully written,  
typed and e-signed by  
Asiana Williams**

Sent: 10/29/2024

 **Write a reply**

*90612*





hyphen sign in e sign so  
I'm going to try to write it  
again without that.

Sent: 11/8/2024

ASIANA

12:17

On this 8th day of  
November, 2024  
I Asiana Williams, hereby  
give Curtis Dexter Hull  
the authority to be my  
counsel of choice and to  
assist with my defense  
which is afforded to me  
by the United States  
Constitutions Sixth  
Amendment.

Respectfully written,  
typed, and e signed by  
Asiana Williams

Sent: 11/8/2024

 Write a reply

10 of 12



Members of groups who are competent non-lawyers can assist other members of the group achieve the goals of the group or individual in court without being charged with "unauthorized practice of law". Laymen cannot be expected to know how to protect their rights when dealing with practiced and careful adversaries. (See, Gideon v. Wainwright, 372 U.S. 335, 83 S.Ct. 792, 9 L.Ed.2d 799 (1963), and for them to associate together to help one another to preserve and enforce rights granted them under federal laws cannot be condemned as a threat to legal ethics. Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen v. Virginia ex rel. Virginia State Bar, 377 U.S. 1, 7, 84 S.Ct. 1113, 12 L.Ed.2d 89 (1964)(Laypersons can associate together under the First Amendment to help one another preserve and enforce rights granted them under federal laws and cannot be condemned as a threat to legal ethics or as unauthorized practice of law). See also, United Mine Workers v. Illinois Bar Association, 389 U.S. 217, 88 S.Ct. 353, 19 L.Ed.2d 426 (1967); NAACP v. Button, 371 U.S. 415, 83 S.Ct. 328, 9 L.Ed.2d 405 (1963)(line of cases where U.S. Supreme Court held that a State may not pass statutes prohibiting the unauthorized practice of law or to interfere with the Right to Freedom of Speech, Association or Right to Redress Government for Grievances as secured by the First Amendment). Counsel of choice is also protected by the Ninth and Tenth Amendments, secured in the penumbra of these Amendments, particularly the Ninth Amendment, which is protected in the states. Roe v. Wade, 410 U.S. 113, 93 S.Ct. 705, 35 L.Ed.2d 147 (1973)(this case also addressed the "capable of repetition, yet evades review" philosophy).

In the United States Supreme Court ruling in Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen v. Virginia ex rel. Virginia State Bar, 377 U.S. 1, 7 (1964):

"A State could not, by invoking the power to regulate the professional conduct of attorneys, infringe in any way the right of individuals and the public to be fairly represented in lawsuits authorized by Congress to effectuate a basic public interest. Laymen cannot be expected to know how to protect their rights when dealing with practiced and carefully counseled adversaries, cf. Gideon v. Wainwright, 372 U. S. 335, and for them to associate together to help one another to preserve and enforce rights granted them under federal laws cannot be condemned as a threat to legal ethics. The State can no more keep these workers from using their cooperative plan to advise one another than it could use more direct means to bar them from resorting to the courts to vindicate their legal rights. The right to petition the courts cannot be so handicapped."

See also, NAACP v. Button, 371 U.S. 415 (1963); Sperry v. Florida ex rel. Florida

Bar, 373 U.S. 379 (1963)(states may pass no laws on unauthorized practice of law).

The U.S. Department of Justice and Federal Trade Commission, which this letter will also be sent to, have addressed the use of non-lawyers to handle legal matters, and say that non-lawyers should be permitted to compete with attorneys. Competition will lead to lower prices, better products and services, and enhanced consumer choice. [http://www.ftc.gov/opp/advocacy\\_date.shtml](http://www.ftc.gov/opp/advocacy_date.shtml); [http://www.abanet.org/rppt/section\\_info/upl/FTCreProposedModelDefinition.pdf](http://www.abanet.org/rppt/section_info/upl/FTCreProposedModelDefinition.pdf); <http://www.ftc.gov/be/V070004.pdf>.

In its advocacy opinion letter to New York State Assemblywoman Helene E. Weinstein, dated April 27, 2007, the United States Justice Department/Federal Trade Commission stated the following with regard to New York Assembly Bill A01837 and A05596, <http://www.ftc.gov/be/V070004.pdf>:

"We are concerned that the proposed legislation, which would prevent non-attorneys from competing with attorneys in situations where there is no clear showing that non-attorney service providers have caused consumer harm, is not in the best interests of consumers."

The Justice Department and the FTC went on to say that they are entrusted with enforcing the federal antitrust laws:

"We work to promote free and unfettered competition in all sectors of the American economy. The United States Supreme Court has observed that "ultimately competition will produce not only lower prices, but also better goods and services." The heart of our

11 of 12

3:46

89%

**NAACP v. Button (1...**  
**firstamendment.mtsu....***January 1, 2009 last updated on July 2, 2024*

In *NAACP v. Button*, 371 U.S. 415 (1963), the Supreme Court protected the First Amendment rights of a civil rights group to engage in public interest litigation. The Virginia state chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) sued Button, the attorney general of Virginia, to enjoin enforcement of a 1956 state statute that prevented groups or third-party entities from litigating on behalf of potential clients. In this photo, lawyers and

12 of 12







Dexter Hull <dexter2bros@gmail.com>

---

**updated motion to exclude cell phone**

1 message

Dexter Hull <dexter2bros@gmail.com>

Sat, Nov 9, 2024 at 3:12 PM

To: Dexter Hull <dexter2bros@gmail.com>, Darren Keys <legalinfoallstars@gmail.com>

**UNITED**

**MIDDLE**

**STATES DISTRICT COURT**

**DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

**NO. 3:23-CR-27**

**V.**

**ASIANA CHRISTINE WILLIAMS**

**UPDATED EMERGENCY**

**MOTION TO EXCLUDE CERI'S CELL PHONE**

COMES NOW, Your Movant, Asiana Christine Williams, moving this honorable court for an order granting the requested relief to exclude Ceri's cell phone as it was tampered with and was not used in proper protocol for collecting evidence. In support, your defendant offers the following:

- \*The DNA test will show that there was no DNA on the Phone
- \* The fingerprint test will show that there were no fingerprints on the phone
- \* There were messages deleted from the cell phone
- \*The detective kept the phone for 3 days before turning it in to evidence

1 of 5

\* CJ spoke up on August 6th, at the trial for Asiana Williams. The judge had received some motions that had Asia's signature on them. The judge asked Asia did she sign them. Asia said "No, but I had them filled ~~out~~ on my behalf." (Asia had asked CJ many times to adopt the motions that were filed in CJ's 5-month absence. CJ had told Asia earlier that THE PROSECUTION told him NOT TO READ THE MOTIONS because they were frivolous. CJ only gave Asia 3 of the 12 motions that were filed and he told Asia that they were frivolous and that they would be rejected. The 6th Amendment promises Asia assistance with her defense. CJ was to work with Asia's defense, which were the motions, and modify them until they were ready to be adopted. CJ refused to assist in any way. He didn't file one motion because Michelle told him they were frivolous. CJ told Asia that he didn't read them all because they were frivolous.) Asia was in a hard place to be in, you have your lawyer that ignores EVERYTHING that you ask him to do but your lawyer does what the prosecution tells him to do. Not only does your attorney not do what you ask him to do, but now that this lawyer has been forced on you, you cant speak for herself or have anyone else help her with her defense.

CJ told the judge that he looked at the motions and they were all frivolous. He then gave an example of a frivolous motion. He chose the Motion to Exclude the Cell Phone. CJ said that the motion was frivolous because the father gave the detective permission to unlock the cell phone. CJ was demonstrating his hypocrisy. CJ used to be a prosecutor. CJ is very familiar with the proper protocol for collecting evidence so that it doesn't get excluded or contaminated. CJ knows that the father couldn't give the detective permission to open the phone, look through the phone, delete messages from the phone, destroy DNA on the phone, destroy fingerprints on the phone or keep the phone for 3 days before turning it in to the jail's evidence. The DNA and the Fingerprints ~~Could~~ have told us a lot about Ceri's last day on Earth..If anyone knows the proper protocol, it is a prosecutor. CJ knew the cell phone was corrupted and contaminated but told the court that the motion was frivolous. Shame, Shame, Shame, and he did this on a murder trial. Could he possibly be more egregious? CJ should have gone and sat next to Michelle for the rest of the trial.

This shows CJ's lack of integrity when he would not adopt the motion to exclude the cell phone but chose to lie to the court and say that the motion was frivolous because the father gave the detective permission to unlock the phone. The father had the authority to allow the detective to look at the father's phone or his wife's phone, but not Ceri's phone. Ceri's phone is evidence in a murder trial. If the police can just take evidence whenever they want, let them drive the stolen car, that was used in a drive-by shooting, for a week and then turn it in to evidence. Better than that, let the detective take the sweat suit off of the guy that died of a drug overdose, and wear the sweat suit to the gym and work out in it and then turn the sweat suit in to evidence or let the detectives that found the gloves at the Ron Goldman and Nicole Simpson murder and go and change a transmission with the gloves and then turn the gloves in to evidence. These examples almost sound as ridiculous as CJ saying that the motion to exclude the cell phone was frivolous because the father gave the detective permission to take at a prime piece of evidence for 3 days before it was turned in to police's evidence. We have a protocol for collecting evidence for a reason. It preserves the integrity of the evidence and maintains the chain of custody.

2 of 5

Wherefore, your movant asks this honorable court to enter an order excluding Ceri's cell phone in the interest of justice and to preserve the integrity of the justice system.

Done this 8th day of November 2024.

Respectfully submitted,

Asiana Williams

Asiana Williams

By Curtis Dexter Hall  
Power of Attorney

3 of 5



**PRIORITY MAIL EXPRESS®**

**FLAT RATE ENVELOPE**  
ONE RATE ■ ANY WEIGHT

RECEIVED  
SCRANTON, PA  
NOV 13 2024

To schedule free Package Pickup, scan the QR code.



USPS.COM/PICKUP



PS10001000006

EP13F July 2022  
OD: 12 1/2 x 9 1/2

**UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE®**  
**PRIORITY MAIL EXPRESS®**


**CUSTOMER USE ONLY**  
FROM: (PLEASE PRINT)  
Dexter Hull  
4483 Lionshead Cir  
Lithonia, GA 30038  
PHONE 770 283 0099

**DELIVERY OPTIONS (Customer Use Only)**  
☐ SIGNATURE REQUIRED: See the meter next check the "Signature Required" box if the meter: 1) requires Signature Required, OR 2) purchases additional insurance, OR 3) purchases COD service, OR 4) requires Return Receipt service. If the box is not checked, the Postal Service will leave the item in the addressee's mailbox or other secure location without attempting to obtain the addressee's signature on delivery.  
**Delivery Options**  
☐ No Saturday Delivery (delivered next business day)  
☐ Sunday/Holiday Delivery (delivered additional business days after delivery)  
☐ "Refer to USPS.com" or local Post Office for availability.

**TO: (PLEASE PRINT)**  
District Court  
Clerks Office  
235 North Washington Ave  
Scranton, PA  
ZIP+4 (U.S. ADDRESSES ONLY)  
18503

■ For pickup or USPS Tracking™, visit USPS.com or call 800-222-1811.  
■ \$100.00 Insurance Included.

**PEEL FROM THIS CORNER**



ER 135 189 392 US

**PAYMENT BY ACCOUNT (if applicable)**  
Federal Agency Acct. No. or Postal Service® Acct. No.

ORIGIN (POSTAL SERVICE USE ONLY)		SCHEDULED DELIVERY DATE (MMDDYY)		POSTAGE	
<input type="checkbox"/> 1-Day	<input type="checkbox"/> 2-Day			<input type="checkbox"/> Military	<input type="checkbox"/> DPO
30321	11-12-24				
Date Accepted (MMDDYY)	Scheduled Delivery Time	Insurance Fee	COD Fee		
11-9-24	11:50 PM	\$	\$		
Time Accepted		Return Receipt Fee	Live Animal Transportation Fee		
4:37 PM		\$	\$		
Special Handling/Fragile	Sunday/Holiday Premium Fee	Total Postage & Fees			
\$	\$	32.00			
Weight	Acceptance Employee Initials				
lb. oz.	113				
<b>DELIVERY (POSTAL SERVICE USE ONLY)</b>					
Delivery Attempt (MMDDYY)	Time	Employee Signature			
Delivery Attempt (MMDDYY)	Time	Employee Signature			

LABEL 11-3, NOVEMBER 2023 PSN 7000-02-000-0008

